

1. Historic Preservation Commission 3.2.20

Documents:

[MHPC AGENDA 3-2-2020 FINAL.PDF](#)

2. Historic Preservation Commission

Documents:

[2015-2016 DESIGN GUIDELINES CHANGES-DRAFT.PDF](#)



# City of Marietta

205 Lawrence Street  
Post Office Box 609  
Marietta, Georgia 30061

## Meeting Agenda

### MARIETTA HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

*David Freedman, Chairman*  
*Rebecca Nash Paden, Vice Chair*  
*Martin C. Kendall*  
*Carol Williams*  
*Mark Kirk*  
*Steve Imler*  
*Christopher Campbell*

---

Monday, March 2, 2020

6:00 PM

Marietta City Hall Council Chamber

---

#### CALL TO ORDER:

#### MINUTES:

**20200208 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Review and approval of the February 3, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission regular meeting minutes.

#### BUSINESS:

**20131378 Polk, Maple, Moon, Holland District**

Continue discussion regarding the formation of this historic district; include any new information regarding area contacts.

**20140385 Church Cherokee Historic District**

Continue to discuss current status and any additional updates related to Church Cherokee Historic District signage.

**20200207 Customization of Design Guidelines by District**

Discussion

**20200209      Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Presentation**

HPC Commissioner Carol Brown will provide a brief overview of her experience at the 2019 Statewide Preservation Conference held in Rome Georgia.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Changes Made to the Draft Design Guidelines by the HPC  
in Response to Public Input

The HPC has held 3 public information meetings to seek homeowner input into the draft Design Guidelines for the proposed Church-Cherokee-Freyer-Seminole-Frances Historic District. Comments and suggestions from each meeting have been incorporated into the guidelines, with a total of 35 changes being made. The intent is to balance the merits of preservation with the practicalities of some changes.

The changes to the Design Guidelines fall into several categories:

- Clarifying coverage of practical situations facing homeowners today
  - a. Clarifying language about the addition of porches (page 54)
  - b. Clarifying language about addition of a front walk (page 46)
  - c. Clarifying language about addition of a second story (page 71)
  - d. Clarifying language about using modern materials for siding or shutters (pages 59 and 62)
  
- Making it clear that some sections are for guidance only and may not require a Certificate of Appropriateness
  - a. Ornamental landscaping (page 51 and 90)
  - b. Driveways (pages 43 and 44, 80 and 81)
  - c. Exterior lighting (page 52 and 91)
  
- Making the Guidelines less restrictive by removing the concept of visually differentiating new construction from old (pages 66, 68, 71, 74, 78, 84)

## CHURCH CHEROKEE DESIGN GUIDELINES

### *Summary of Changes from February 2, 2016 HPC meeting*

1. Page 4 – In first sentence of last paragraph, changed “adopted” to “derived.”
2. Page 46 – Struck first sentence of first bullet point under Not Recommended: ~~A new entrance walk should not be installed where one did not previously exist; it should be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.~~
3. Page 52 – Added the following language to the end of the first paragraph *“outdoor lighting should provide sufficient illumination while not casting a glare on the property, the public right of way or other surrounding properties. The goal is to provide subtle illumination with minimal visual impact from the lighting fixtures.”*
4. Page 54 – Removed last sentence of second-to-last bullet point under Recommended: ~~The new porch should also be constructed in such a way as to make the addition reversible for future owners.~~
5. Page 66 – Removed second bullet point under Recommended: ~~The character of design elements should be altered slightly from the traditional design to differentiate the new addition from the original historic structure.~~
6. Page 68 - Removed second bullet point under Recommended: ~~Windows should be different in design and detailing to distinguish the addition from the historic building. This should be done while still keeping the design and detailing compatible with the historic building.~~

~~Removed second bullet point under Not Recommended: An addition’s windows should not replicate exactly those in the historic building so that one cannot distinguish between what is new and what is historic.~~

7. Page 71 – Edited the first bullet under Recommended to remove ~~“distinguishable from the original form of the historic structure, but should be.”~~
8. Page 74 – Removed first bullet under Not Recommended: ~~A porch addition should not create a false historic appearance (should not appear to be a historic reproduction or replica too imitative of a historic style) so that it is possible to distinguish the original structure from the new addition.~~
9. Page 77 – In the first sentence of the last paragraph, changed “Kennesaw Avenue” to “Church Cherokee Streets.”
10. Page 78 – Removed first bullet point under Recommended: ~~Design elements on new construction in a historic district should not replicate design elements on original historic structures.~~
11. Page 84 – Removed first (and only) bullet under Not Recommended: ~~New buildings should not replicate historic windows and doors so that one cannot distinguish between what is new and what is historic.~~

**Summary of Changes from September & December 2015 Draft**  
*(incorporating changes proposed by Christopher Brown, Steven Imler, David Freedman)*

1. Corrected numbering errors between sections and table of contents. This affected almost all pages.

**Content revisions:**

2. Page 4 - Added language in introduction:  
*These guidelines are written with the purpose of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance in mind – "to protect and enhance the historical and aesthetic attraction to tourists and visitors and thereby promote and stimulate business, and to provide for the protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and use of places, districts, sites, buildings, structures, and works of art having a special historic, architectural, cultural, or aesthetic interest or value, and to provide reasonable flexibility for property owners to improve and maintain their properties below certain thresholds, and for special circumstances."*
3. Page 13 – Added district boundaries.
4. Page 24 - Added new bullet item under "A CoA is NOT necessary for...:"  
*Any activity that does not require a building or demolition permit*
5. Pages 43 & 44 – Added to bottom of pages:  
***\*\*Note:*** *A Certificate of Appropriateness may not be required for a driveway. This section is for guidance only.*
6. Page 46 - Added text under first bullet of "Not Recommended:"  
*If a new entrance walk is proposed, its design and materials should be consistent with the style, size, and period of the house.*
7. Page 47 – corrected typo ("woo" to "wood").
8. Page 49 - Changed "shall" to "should" in third bullet of "Recommended;" changed "and" to "or" under first bullet of "Not Recommended."
9. Page 51 – Added new bullet under "Not Recommended" stating "**Removal of mature, healthy hardwood trees.**" Also added "***\*\*Note:*** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in landscaping. This section is for guidance only.*"
10. Pages 52 – Added to bottom of page:  
***\*\*Note:*** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in outdoor lighting. This section is for guidance only.*
11. Page 54 – Added new bullet under "Recommended":  
*If there is no evidence that a porch previously existed, new porches may be constructed on any façade as long as it respects the pattern, scale, size, style, decorative elements, and overall design of other porches in the area. The new porch should also be constructed in such a way as to make the addition reversible for future owners.*  
Also removed bullet under "Not Recommended" stating "Addition of porches, unless there is pictorial documentation or physical evidence of a historic porch."
12. Page 59 – Under last bullet of "Recommended," added the text "*Modern, durable materials will be considered on a case by case basis.*"
13. Page 62 – Added text to the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet under "Recommended:" *and may be made from synthetic materials that closely resemble wood.*"
14. Page 65- Deleted a portion of the last sentence in the first paragraph under "Principle of Compatibility for Additions:" "...by being compatible, but should be distinct enough to be distinguishable from the original building."
15. Page 67- Changed "shall" to "should" in 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet under "Recommended."
16. Page 69- Replaced "shall" and "must" under 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> bullets with "should."

17. Page 71 – Added under “Recommended”: *“While second story additions, commonly known as “pop-top” renovations, are generally discouraged, they can be a viable option when the addition emulates the overall appearance of the existing first level, and does not significantly alter the architectural styling of the original structure when viewed from the street.”*  
Removed from “Not Recommended:” *“Additions that increase the height of the existing historic structure, or “pop-tops,” are inappropriate.”*
18. Page 73 - Added to bottom of page: **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in outdoor lighting. This section is for guidance only.*
19. Page 77 - Deleted a portion of the paragraph under “Principle of Compatibility of New Construction:” *“...and quantifiable design elements, including setbacks, scale, and proportions, should be within ten percent of the established extremes of measurement within a given block face.”*
20. Page 79 – corrected the spelling of principal under 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet of “Recommended.”
21. Pages 80 & 81- Added to bottom of pages: **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness may not be required for a driveway. This section is for guidance only.*
22. Page 90 – Added “Not Recommended” stating *“Removal of mature, healthy hardwood trees.”*  
Also added **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in landscaping. This section is for guidance only.*
23. Page 91 - Added to bottom of page: **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in outdoor lighting. This section is for guidance only.*
24. Added full text of HPC Ordinance under Section 11.3 instead of code reference.
25. Page 122 – Added to the bottom of the page: **\*\*Note:** *This section is for reference only.*

**Summary of Changes from September & December 2015 Draft**  
*(incorporating changes proposed by Christopher Brown, Steven Imler, David Freedman)*

1. Corrected numbering errors between sections and table of contents. This affected almost all pages.

**Content revisions:**

2. Page 4 - Added language in introduction:  
These guidelines are written with the purpose of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance in mind – *“to protect and enhance the historical and aesthetic attraction to tourists and visitors and thereby promote and stimulate business, and to provide for the protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and use of places, districts, sites, buildings, structures, and works of art having a special historic, architectural, cultural, or aesthetic interest or value, and to provide reasonable flexibility for property owners to improve and maintain their properties below certain thresholds, and for special circumstances.”*
3. Page 13 – Added district boundaries.
4. Page 24 - Added new bullet item under “A CoA is NOT necessary for...:”  
Any activity that does not require a building or demolition permit
5. Pages 43 & 44 – Added to bottom of pages:  
**\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness may not be required for a driveway. This section is for guidance only.*
6. Page 46 - Added text under first bullet of “Not Recommended:”  
If a new entrance walk is proposed, its design and materials should be consistent with the style, size, and period of the house.
7. Page 47 – corrected typo (“woo” to “wood”).
8. Page 49 - Changed “shall” to “should” in third bullet of “Recommended;” changed “and” to “or” under first bullet of “Not Recommended.”
9. Page 51 – Added new bullet under “Not Recommended” stating “Removal of mature, healthy hardwood trees.” Also added **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in landscaping. This section is for guidance only.”*
10. Pages 52 – Added to bottom of page:  
**\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in outdoor lighting. This section is for guidance only.*
11. Page 54 – Added new bullet under “Recommended”:  
If there is no evidence that a porch previously existed, new porches may be constructed on any façade as long as it respects the pattern, scale, size, style, decorative elements, and overall design of other porches in the area. The new porch should also be constructed in such a way as to make the addition reversible for future owners.  
Also removed bullet under “Not Recommended” stating “Addition of porches, unless there is pictorial documentation or physical evidence of a historic porch.”
12. Page 59 – Under last bullet of “Recommended,” added the text *“Modern, durable materials will be considered on a case by case basis.”*
13. Page 62 – Added text to the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet under “Recommended:” *and may be made from synthetic materials that closely resemble wood.”*
14. Page 65- Deleted a portion of the last sentence in the first paragraph under “Principle of Compatibility for Additions:” *“...by being compatible, but should be distinct enough to be distinguishable from the original building.”*
15. Page 67- Changed “shall” to “should” in 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet under “Recommended.”
16. Page 69- Replaced “shall” and “must” under 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> bullets with “should.”



17. Page 71 – Added under “Recommended”: *“While second story additions, commonly known as “pop-top” renovations, are generally discouraged, they can be a viable option when the addition emulates the overall appearance of the existing first level, and does not significantly alter the architectural styling of the original structure when viewed from the street.”*  
Removed from “Not Recommended:” *“Additions that increase the height of the existing historic structure, or “pop-tops,” are inappropriate.”*
18. Page 73 - Added to bottom of page: **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in outdoor lighting. This section is for guidance only.*
19. Page 77 - Deleted a portion of the paragraph under “Principle of Compatibility of New Construction:” *“...and quantifiable design elements, including setbacks, scale, and proportions, should be within ten percent of the established extremes of measurement within a given block face.”*
20. Page 79 – corrected the spelling of principal under 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet of “Recommended.”
21. Pages 80 & 81- Added to bottom of pages: **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness may not be required for a driveway. This section is for guidance only.*
22. Page 90 – Added “Not Recommended” stating *“Removal of mature, healthy hardwood trees.”*  
Also added **\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in landscaping. This section is for guidance only.”*
23. Page 91 - Added to bottom of page:**\*\*Note:** *A Certificate of Appropriateness is not required for a change in outdoor lighting. This section is for guidance only.*
24. Added full text of HPC Ordinance under Section 11.3 instead of code reference.
25. Page 122 – Added to the bottom of the page: **\*\*Note:** *This section is for reference only.*